IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PIUS C.KURIAKOSE

FRIDAY, THE 27TH JULY 2007 / 5TH SRAVANA 1929

CRP.No. 417 of 2002()

AA.7/2000 of APPELLATE AUTHORITY (LR), ALAPPUZHA
IN OA NO.1 OF 1993 OF DEPUTY COLLECTOR, ALAPPUZHA

.....

REVN. PETITIONER: REVISION PETITIONER/APPELLANT/RESPONDENT

SRI.HAMEED SUBAIR, CHARAMPARAMBIL,
ALISSERY WARD, ALAPPUZHA.

BY ADV. SRI.VARGHESE P.THOMAS

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS/PETTIONERS

---

1. THAJUNNISA, GREEN LAND BAKERY,
ALISSERY WARD, ALAPPUZHA.

2. N.IQUBAL, GREEN LAND BAKERY,
ALISSERY WARD, ALAPPUZHA.

3. N.SUNITHA, GREEN LAND BAKERY,
ALISSERY WARD, ALAPPUZHA.

4. N.ARIFA, GREEN LAND BAKERY,
ALISSERY WARD ALAPPUZHA.

5. N.NASEEMA, GREEN LAND BAKERY
ALISSERY WARD, ALAPPUZHA.

6. N.ISHA, GREEN LAND BAKERY,
ALISSERY WARD, ALAPPUZHA.

7. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY CHIEF
SECRETARY, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.S.SHANAVAS KHAN
R7 BY ADV. SRI. SHYSON P. MANGUZHA,GOVT. PLEADER

THIS CIVIL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 27/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

CRP : 417 OF 2002

ORDER ON CMP Nos. 953 AND 7049 OF 2002 IN CRP No.417 OF 2002

DISMISSED.

27.07.2007 SD/- PIUS C. KURIAKOSE, JUDGE.

PIUS C. KURIAKOSE, J.

C.R.P. No. 417 OF 2002

Dated this the 27th day of July, 2007

O R D E R

This Revision Petition under Section 103 of the Kerala Land Reforms Act is directed against concurrent orders passed by the authorities under the Land Reforms Act revising the contract rent of land which was leased out in 1958 for commercial purpose to the petitioner from Rs.5/- per mensum to Rs.150/- per mensum. I find that the revision was so made by the Land Tribunal on the basis of very valuable evidence in the form of advocate commissioner's report and also oral evidence adduced by the parties. The land in question is situated in a commercially very important locality of the Alappuzha town having in close proximity to the Collectorate junction. Even though the present enhancement may be 30 times of the original contract rate, the fact remains that even after the present enhancement the rent payable by the petitioner comes to only Rs.150/- per month. According to me, by all standards the said rate is reasonable. I do not find any error of law vitiating the impugned order warranting interference in the revisional jurisdiction under Section 103 of the Land Reforms Act.

The Civil Revision Petition will stand dismissed.

PIUS C. KURIAKOSE, JUDGE

btt